

TITLE: A methodological exhibition of the theory of the identification of Lineal Dynamic systems.

AUTHORS: Gloria Beatríz Nuñez Rodríguez., Rosina Hing Cortón and Diosdado L. Villegas Villegas

SUMMARY

The important role of Mathematics in the scientific development of humanity is determined by the possibility of elaborating mathematical models of the objects studied in the different spheres of science. In other terms, it means, describing by means of the rigorous language of mathematics the properties and relationships of these objects, that in turn it allows the application of the rigorous and precise techniques of this science to the problems related with the study of the real objects facilitating this way the adquisition of conclusions on these and even to control their behavior.

The application of these models and methods of mathematics have been increased significantly from the second half of the XX century, due to: the appearance and development of the calculation techniques, the introduction of the systemic focus in the sciences and the development of new branches that it constitutes the Modern Applied Mathematics.

The fundamental objective of mathematics in the formation of specialists in the different branches of the science and technical areas is to establish that they are capable of applying the mathematical modelation and the calculation experiment, like new technology of the scientific work in all the spheres of the professional activity. To achieve this objective it is necessary to develop in the students abilities for: the application of logical forms of thinking, the application of the mathematical concepts in the description of the objects and relationships among the real objects and for the elaboration, selection and application of the most efficient algorithms for the computational solution of the outlined problems.[1]

The identification theory and realization of the dynamic systems is a medullary aspect in the modern control theory that consists fundamentally in that, starting from the knowledge of the behavior entrance-exit, obtained experimentally in the case of the identification, or given previously in the case of the realization, to build a state model that carries out this behavior. This content is not generally treated in the pre-graduate courses, for the systems of multiple entrances and multiple exits.

In this work it is demonstrated that the identification theory and realization of the lineal dynamic systems can be imparted in the technical careers starting from the results of Mathematical Analysis and Lineal Algebra received by the students in pre-graduate studies, without necessity of adding new contents in the programs of this subjects

We propose a new form of imparting the theory of identification and realization of the lineal dynamic systems based on the intuition and the physical interpretation of the concepts.

INTRODUCTION

The daily work of mathematicians necessarily consists in obtaining new theorems, the discovery of new connections among concepts already well-known and the introduction of new concepts. However, this is not the only objective of mathematical investigation, the academic A. N. Kolmogorov also considered as important objectives of mathematical investigation the following :

1-Carry the modern logical foundations of mathematics to such a level that they can be exposed the scholars from 14 to 15 years.

2 - To destroy the divergences among the rigorous methods of the pure mathematicians and the non rigorous focuses of the mathematical reasonings used by the applied mathematicians, the physicists and the technologists.[2]

With relationship to these objectives the mathematicians have the task of elaborating the logical foundations of the irreproachable mathematical intuitions, in which the rigorous calculation methods are based, arisen from the alive intuition of the physicists and the technologists that have been validated in the practice. But these foundations lead in occasions to constructions so sophisticated and complex that make the mathematicians proud, but that the physicists and engineers would not have the possibility to assimilate if the necessary effort was not carried out to make it accessible to them

This work meets the first objective of the investigation outlined by Kolmogorov and has as a result:

To develop the identification theory and realization of the lineal dynamic systems starting from the results of Mathematical Analysis and Lineal Algebra received by the students in pre-graduate studies with a methodological focus that facilitates their assimilation for the students starting from the pre-grad level.

DEVELOPMENT

In this work a methodology is presented for the exposing of the problem of obtaining a state model of a dynamic system, starting from the knowledge of its entry- exit behaviour, given by a transfer matrix, so that this is understandable by the students from the pre-grad level whose mathematical foundation is based on results of Functional Analysis and of the theory of matrixes whose elements are rational functions. With this methodology it is avoided to use sophisticated and complex mathematical theories.

The structural unit and logics of the exhibition is guaranteed by means of the application of analysis procedures, synthesis, comparison exemplification and of the intuition starting from the physical interpretation of the mathematical concepts and the mathematical description of the physical problems.

MODELLING OF SISO SYSTEMS .

Starting from the analysis of different cases already well-known, as the one-dimensional movement of a body under the action of an external force, the circulation of the current in a circuit R-L, due to the application of a voltage source in the net, studied inside the Physics, etc. will establish that the students can arrive at the conclusion that the modelation of many technical problems leads to the position of a system with a simple entrance and a simple exit (SISO)

Where:

$u(t)$: are the variables of entry of the system that contain the information on the environment of what is disposed and the impacts in the behavior of the study object.

$y(t)$: are the variables of exit of the system that contain the information which is able to be captured through the sensors.

$x(t)$: variables of state of the system that contain the minimum quantity of information on the system that is enough to predict their future behavior.

If the physical laws that govern the behavior of the real system are known and also this does not vary with regard to the adjournments in the time and it satisfies the overlapping principle, that is to say it is stationary and lineal, and it is also initially in rest, the mathematical pattern is obtained:

$$(D^n + a_1 D^{n-1} + \dots + a_{n-1} D + a_n) X(t) = u(t), \quad X(0) = 0 \quad (1)$$

$$y(t) = (b_0 + b_1 D + \dots + b_k D^k) X(t), \quad k \leq n \quad (2)$$

Through the application of Laplace Transformation, the results obtained are:

$$Y(S) = G(S) U(S) \quad (3)$$

where:

$$G(S) = \frac{b_0 + b_1 S + \dots + b_k S^k}{S^n + a_1 S^{n-1} + \dots + a_{n-1} S + a_n} \quad (4)$$

it is denominated function of transfer of the system (which can be interpreted as the transformation of Laplace of the answer to the unitary impulse)

Using the transformation of coordinated, $x^{i-1}(t) = x_i(t)$ $i=1, \dots, n$, the equations (1) and (2) can be expressed by means of the normal system of order n

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X} &= AX + BU \\ Y &= CX \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ 0 & & I_{n-1} & \\ \vdots & & & \\ -a_n & -a_{n-1} & \dots & -a_1 \end{pmatrix}; \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad y \quad C = (b_0 \quad b_1 \quad \dots \quad b_k \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad 0)$$

being I_{n-1} the unitary womb of size $(n-1)$, $X \in R^n$, $A \in M(n, n)$,

$B \in M(n, 1)$ and $C \in M(1, n)$. The womb A it is known in the literature like main partner of the characteristic polynomial of the equation (1)

We can observe that the transfer function $G(S)$ it is a rational function where the degree of the polynomial of the denominator coincides with the number of variables that intervene in the system and the polynomial of the numerator is associated to the exit of the system. Comparing (4) and (5) it is easy to establish a correspondence biunivoca among the pattern entry/exit given by the transfer matrix and the state model given by the tern (A, B, C) and pass from one to another without using the equations (1) and (2).

This type of model is denominated "state model" and the variable x_i ; $i=1, \dots, n$; are denominated state variables.

MODELLING OF MIMO SYSTEMS

Many of the problems that are presented in practicals respond to a model of multiple entrances and multiple exits (MIMO). We will Consider that these

systems satisfy the overlapping principle and they are invariable with regard to the translation in time, that is to say that they are lineal and stationary. We will also suppose that it demands the maximum degree of pairing between the entrances and the exits. Then for the linealidad of the system it can be planted that:

$$y_i = y_{i1} + y_{i2} + \dots + y_{ij} + \dots + y_{ir} \quad (6)$$

where y_{ij} represents the effect of the entry (j-ésima) in the exit (i-ésima), this means that it is the signal of the exit (i-ésima), if only the entry (j-ésima) was not null

$$u_j \neq 0; u_1 = u_2 = \dots = u_{j-1} = \dots = u_n = 0 \quad (7)$$

The same as in the case of the systems SISO where initially an analysis of the system in rest was made, that is to say for those in $u(t) \equiv 0, y(0) \equiv 0$ for $t \leq 0$

If we apply the Transformation of Laplace to the entrances and the exits of (7) we can obtain the transfer function that relates the exit i-ésima with the entrance j-ésima

$$G_{ij} = \frac{Y_{ij}(S)}{U_j(S)} \iff Y_{ij}(S) = G_{ij}(S) U_j(S) \quad (8)$$

After if we apply Transformation of Laplace to (6) and we use (8) we will obtain

$$Y_i(S) = \sum_{j=1}^r G_{ij}(S) U_j(S); i = 1, \dots, m$$

whose matricial form is:

$$Y(S) = G(S) U(S) \quad (9)$$

where:

$G(S) = [G_{ij}(S)]$ ($i = 1, \dots, m; j = 1, \dots, r$) is a matrix of size $m \times r$, $Y(S) \in R^m, U(S) \in R^r$

Notice that equation (9) is the multidimensional analogy of equation (3) therefore we can say (including the multidimensional and the unidimensional case) that the Laplace transformation of the exit vector in a lineal system is a lineal function of the Laplace transformation of the entrance vector, defined by a matrix whose elements are functions of the variable (s) and that it is denominated transfer matrix. The physical interpretation of this matrix can also be made intending to apply to each entrance for shift a very narrow and sharp pulse, of unitary area, that ideally is equal to apply $u_k(t) = \delta_{kj} \delta(t)$ in the experiment j-ésimo, $k, j = 1, \dots, r$, in each experiment the exits are measured and the observations $y_{ij}(t)$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, r$. The matrix $[y_{ij}(t)]$ is the answer matrix to the unitary impulse and the Laplace transformation $[L^{-1}\{y_{ij}(t)\}] = G(s)$, is the transfer matrix.

To continue, the following problem is planted: ¿How to obtain the transfer matrix starting from the state model?

Be a state MIMO model:

$$\dot{X} = AX + BU$$

$$Y = CX$$

Applying the Laplace Transformation, we obtain:

$$S X(S) = A X(S) + B U(S)$$

$$Y(S) = C X(S)$$

Making $X(S)$ the subject of the formula in the first equation and substituting in the second equation we obtain:

$$Y(S) = C(SI-A)^{-1}BU(S)$$

The transfer matrices is given by:

$$G(S) = C(SI-A)^{-1}B$$

This means that the solution of the problem outlined only requires algebraic calculations of inversion and multiplication of matrices that can be solved with the help of MatLab.

REALIZATION OF STATIONARY LINEAL SYSTEMS

Let us analyze the inverse problem: Given the transfer matrix $G(S) = G_{ij}(S)$ ($i=1, \dots, m$; $j=1, \dots, n$) obtained using the formula experimentally (9) and carrying out the measurement that were indicated when giving the geometric interpretation of the transfer matrix.

How to obtain the state pattern?

This inverse problem that one knows with the name of realization problem, has great importance from a practical point of view and its physical interpretation would be the following :

Given a real system, with consistent uncertainty in that we don't know the physical laws that govern their development in time neither even define their state variables, we only have the possibility to excite the system with certain entrance signs and through the measuring of certain exit signs in order to analyze their behavior .

We will use an inductive method, that is to say, through the analysis of particular cases we will try to infer a general methodology.

Be the system: has two entrances and an exit, this means that the investigator can apply two types of entrance signs, for example (an electric field and a magnetic field, or pressure and temperature) and it can measure an exit. Therefore the transfer matrix has the type:

$$[G_{11}(S) \ G_{12}(S)]$$

By means of the formula (9) and the experiments described in the physical interpretation of the transfer function, it is concluded:

1st experiment: $u_1 = \delta(t)$, $u_2(t) = 0$, $y(t) = \text{Exp}(-t)$, then $G_{11}(t) = \frac{Y(S)}{U_1(S)} = \frac{1}{S+1}$

2nd experiment: $u_1(t) = 0$, $u_2 = \delta(t)$, $y(t) = \text{Cosh}(t)$, then $G_{12}(t) = \frac{Y(S)}{U_2(S)} = \frac{S}{S^2-1}$

Then

$$G(S) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{S+1} & \frac{S}{S^2-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

Comparing the results obtained in (4) and (5) we arrive for analogy to the following submodels:

The corresponding to G_{11} represented by the tern (A_{11}, B_{11}, C_{11}) where:

$A_{11} = (-1)$; $B_{11} = (1)$ and $C_{11} = (1)$

And the corresponding to G_{12} represented by the tern (A_{12}, B_{12}, C_{12}) where:

$$A_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, B_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then the resulting system is:

$$\dot{x}_1 = -x_1 + u_1$$

$$\dot{x}_2 = x_3$$

$$\dot{x}_3 = x_2 + u_2$$

$$y_1 = x_1 + x_3$$

whose state model is defined by the tern (A, B, C) where:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

In order to synthesize and to generalize the obtained methodology it will be requested the students make an elaboration of an algorithm like the following one:

Entry of data:

$$\text{To receive } G = [G_{ij}] \text{ (} i = 1, \dots, m; j = 1, \dots, n \text{); } G_{ij} = \frac{b_0^{(i,j)} + b_1^{(i,j)} S + \dots + b_{k_{ij}}^{(i,j)} S^{k_{ij}}}{S^{n_{ij}} + a_1^{(i,j)} S^{n_{ij}-1} + \dots + a_{n_{ij}}^{(i,j)}}$$

Construction of sub models:

For each $j = 1, \dots, r$

For each $i = 1, \dots, m$

To construct $A_{ij} \in M(n_{ij}, n_{ij})$

Make the last line equal to: $[-a_{n_{ij}}^{(i,j)} \dots - a_1^{(i,j)}]$

$$\text{Make the first column equal to: } \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ -a_{n_{ij}}^{(i,j)} \end{pmatrix}$$

Complete the matrix A_{ij} with the unitary matrix $I_{n_{ij}-1}$

Define

$$b^{(i,j)} \in R^{n_{ij}}, b^{(i,j)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Define

$$C^{(i,j)} \in R^{n_{ij}}, C^{(i,j)} = \begin{pmatrix} b_0^{(i,j)} & b_1^{(i,j)} & \dots & b_{k_{ij}}^{(i,j)} & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Increase i

Increase j

Make A equal to the cellular diagonal matrix with cells A_{ij} , ($i=1, \dots, m; j=1, \dots, r$)

Make

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} b^{(1,1)} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ b^{(2,1)} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ b^{(n,1)} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & b^{(1,2)} & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & b^{(2,2)} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & b^{(1,r)} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & b^{(2,r)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & b^{(m,r)} \end{pmatrix}$$

make

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} c^{(1,1)} & 0 & \dots & 0 & c^{(1,2)} & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & c^{(1,r)} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & c^{(2,1)} & \dots & 0 & 0 & c^{(2,2)} & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & c^{(2,r)} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & c^{(m,1)} & 0 & 0 & \dots & c^{(m,2)} & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & c^{(m,r)} \end{pmatrix}$$

This methodology will be able to be applied always and provided that they are rational fractions, that which is presented in most of the practical examples. If some element of $G(s)$ it is not a rational fraction, then the system can not be modeled with equations of the type (4).

MODEL OF MINIMAL STATE

Until this moment we have obtained a solution of the problem for the cases in which the elements of the transfer matrix are rational fractions characteristic of the variable s , but can we guarantee that the solution is unique? and in negative case ;Is that the most simple solution? We will try to respond these questions by means of examples, avoiding the demonstration of a mathematical theorem where it can be concluded that the solution of the equation matricial

$C (SI - A)^{-1} B = G(s)$ is not unique

Above all it is defined when two lineal dynamic systems are equivalent, which is referred to as the pair

$(t, x) \in (R, X)$ where X is the state space, a phase and $R \times X$ phase space

Definition: Two lineal dynamic systems with state vectors x y x are algebraically equivalent whenever their numeric phase vectors are related for all t like $(t, \tilde{x}) = (t, T x)$ where T is a non singular matrix of size n . [3]

In the cases that we are analyzing the system of differential equations is lineal and stationary. Be this the state model obtained

$$\dot{X} = AX + BU$$

$$Y = CX \quad (A)$$

Making a base change in the state space by means of the non singular transformation T , $Z = TX$ we obtain a system algebraically equivalent to (A)

$$\dot{Z} = \tilde{A}Z + \tilde{B}U$$

$$Y = \tilde{C} Z \quad (B)$$

where

$$\tilde{A} = T A T^{-1}, \quad \tilde{B} = T B, \quad \tilde{C} = C T^{-1}$$

It is demonstrated that two systems algebraically equivalent have the same transfer matrix and it can be concluded that (A, B, C) and $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$ are solutions different from $G = C (S I - A)^{-1}$ and as a consequence this equation has infinite solutions, since starting from any main non singular matrix T we can obtain the corresponding ones $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$.

This means that by means of the algebraic equivalence we obtain another state model, and therefore this is not unique. For these solutions the state space has the same dimension. KALMAN proved that there are states with different dimensions for the same transfer matrix and it outlined the problem of extracting the pattern of state of minimum dimension, that is to say, given a transfer matrix $G(s)$ to obtain the state pattern with smaller number of variables of possible state.[3]

To obtain the minimal state it is necessary to define what we call completely controllable system and system totally observable.

Definition: A lineal dynamic system is completely controllable if it is not algebraically equivalent to a system of the type:

$$\dot{Z}_1 = A_{11} z_1 + A_{12} z_2 + B_1 u$$

$$\dot{Z}_2 = A_{22} z_2$$

$$Y = c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2$$

where z_1 y z_2 are vectors of n_1 y $n_2 = n - n_1$ components respectively

In other words, if the lineal system (A) is algebraically equivalent to a system that has for state model ternary $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$ such that:

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}; \quad \tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad y \quad \tilde{C} \quad \text{whatever}$$

The system (A) is not completely controllable, that is to say, it is possible to find a system of coordinates in which the variable z_i is separated in two groups $z_1 = (z^1, z^2, \dots, z^{n_1})$, y $z_2 = (z^{n_1+1}, \dots, z^n)$, which are denominated controllable and not controllable respectively.

The application of the definition is annoying since if the initial system has the form of $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$ it is evident that it is controllable, but if it doesn't have, we can not affirm nothing since there are infinite possibilities of algebraic transformations. For such a reason we will apply without demonstration a characterization based on the concept of range of a matrix. We could have used the variant of defining the concept however by means of the characterization that has possible algorithms, it is a very abstract definition. The form that we use gives the possibility to give an intuitive idea, a physical interpretation of the concept and for this reason we have selected it.

The characterization is the following:

In the system:

$$\dot{X} = AX + BU$$

$$Y = CX \quad (A) \quad \text{where } A \in M(n, n)$$

We consider that B is a matrix of the size $n \times r$ and $M_c = [B \ AB \ \dots \ A^{n-1}B]$ a matrix of n rows and $n \times r$ columns called controllable matrix.

"The condition necessary and sufficient for the system (A) to be totally controllable is that

$$R(M_c) = n \quad [4].$$

To obtain the $R(M_c)$ an algorithm is deduced to find the k ($k \leq n$) columns linearly independent of M_c without working jointly with M_c columns.

To receive A y B

To define H , a group of at most n vectors R^n , initially empty

for $\alpha = 1$ to $\alpha = r$ choose $b_\alpha \in B$

make $j = 0$

while $r[b_\alpha \ Ab_\alpha \ A^j b_\alpha] = j+1$

Include the vector column $A^j b_\alpha$ in H

Increase j

Increase α

Return H

End

Definition: The space generated by all the columns linearly independent of the matrix M_c is called controllable space and we will denote it as E_c .

Property: E_c is an invariant [5] with relationship to the system

$$\dot{X} = AX + BU$$

$$Y = CX$$

¿How to separate the completely controllable and not completely controllable spaces?

If $E_c = \langle f_1 \dots f_k \rangle$ being $\{f_1 \dots f_k\}$ a base of E_c and let us complete with the canonical vectors $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ a base of E_n . If the linear transformation $T = [f_1 \dots f_k \ e_{k+1} \dots e_n]$ of E_n such that

$$Z = TX = x_1 f_1 + \dots + x_k f_k + x_{k+1} e_{k+1} + \dots + x_n e_n$$

It is demonstrated that by means of the matrix T a system is obtained algebraically equivalent to (A) whose state model is the terna $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$ where:

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}; \quad \tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad y \quad \tilde{C} \text{ whatever.}$$

It means,

$$\dot{Z}_1 = A_{11} z_1 + A_{12} z_2 + B_1 u$$

$$\dot{Z}_2 = A_{22} z_2$$

$$Y = \tilde{C}z$$

We will now analyze the dual concept with regard to the controllable concept.

Definition: A linear dynamic system is totally observable if this it is not algebraically equivalent to a system of the type:

$$\dot{Z}_1 = A_{11} z_1 + B_1 u$$

$$\dot{Z}_2 = A_{21} z_1 + A_{22} z_2 + B_2 u$$

$$Y = c_1 z_1$$

where z_1 y z_2 are vectors of n_1 and $n_2 = n - n_1$ components respectively. [3]

In other words, if the lineal system (A) is algebraically equivalent to a system that has for state model the tern where:

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & 0 \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}; \tilde{C} = (c_1 \quad 0) \text{ and } \tilde{B} \text{ whatever}$$

The system (A) it is not totally observable, that is to say, it is possible to find a system of coordinates in which the variable z_i is separated in two groups $z_1 = (z^1, z^2, \dots, z^{n_1})$, and $z_2 = (z^{n_1+1}, \dots, z^n)$ which are denominated observables and non observables respectively.

The same as in the study of the control the application of the definition is annoying and for such a reason we apply the following characterization:

In the system:

$$\dot{X} = AX + BU$$

$$Y = CX \quad (A) \text{ where } A \in M(n, n)$$

Consider that C is a matrice of the size $m \times n$ and

$$M_o = \begin{pmatrix} C \\ CA \\ \vdots \\ CA^{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

A matrice of n rows and n columns called matrice of observability

"The condition necessary and sufficient for the system (A) to be totally observable is $R(M_o) = n$ " [4]

As transposing a matrice its range don't vary, it have:

$$r(M_o) = r \begin{pmatrix} C^t & A^t C^t & \dots & (A^t)^{n-1} C^t \end{pmatrix}$$

Note: The system:

$$\dot{X} = AX + BU$$

$$Y = CX$$

It is totally observable if and only if $X = A^t X + C^t U$ is completely controllable, in this sense it is to say that both concepts are dual. Consequently the $R(M_o)$ is calculated equally to $R(M_c)$.

In this case the space generated by the lineally independent rows of M_o is denominated observable space and we will denote it E_o and their complement orthogonal is denominated non observable space (E_{no})

How to separate the sub-spaces E_{no} y E_o ?

Let us suppose that $E_C = [g_1 \dots g_{n-k_1}]$ and $E_{NO} = [v_1 \dots v_{k_1}]$, if we complete the base in the non observable sub-space to a base in the whole space we obtain a matrice T_1 .

If the lineal transformation $T_1 = [v_1 \dots v_{k_1} \quad e_{k_1+1} \dots e_n]$ of E_n such that

$$Z = T_1 X = v_1 x_1 + \dots + v_{k_1} x_{k_1} + v_{k_1+1} e_{k_1+1} + \dots + v_n e_n.$$

Let us demonstrate that by means of the matrice T_1 a system is obtained that is algebraically equivalent to (A) whose state model is the tern $(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C})$. where:

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}; \tilde{B} \text{ whatever and } \tilde{C} = [0 \ C_2], \text{ or if,}$$

$$\dot{Z}_1 = A_{11} z_1 + A_{12} z_2 + B_1 u$$

$$\dot{Z}_2 = A_{22} z_2 + B_2 u$$

$$Y = C_2 z_2$$

Demostration:

$$\text{In effect: } E_{no} = \{ z : z_2 = 0 \} \text{ where } Z = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\text{If } \tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}; \tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } C = [c_1 \ c_2], \text{ therefore the system}$$

is:

$$\dot{Z}_1 = A_{11} z_1 + A_{12} z_2$$

$$\dot{Z}_2 = A_{21} z_1 + A_{22} z_2$$

$$Y = c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2$$

$$\text{We choose } z_0 \in E_{no} \text{ where } Z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} z_{10} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ therefore } z(t) \in E_C; Z(t) = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

belong to E_{no} then, $c_1 z_{10} = 0$

Making z equal to the vectors canonicals of E_{no} in $z_{10}^1 c_1 + z_{10}^2 c_2 + \dots + z_{10}^k c_{k_1} = 0$

we obtain:

$$c_1 = c_2 = \dots = c_{k_1} = 0$$

$$\text{and } \tilde{C} = [0 \ C_2]$$

As $z_2 = 0 \Rightarrow z_2 = 0 \Rightarrow A_{21} z_{10} = 0 \Rightarrow A_{21} = 0$, as z_{10} can be whatever arbitrary in the sub-space of non-controllability. Then

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ 0 & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \text{ obtained the desired}$$

Using analysis procedures and synthesis we can outline the following methodology:

ALGORITHM FOR THE CANONICAL DECOMPOSITION OF A SISTEMA MIMO, LINEAL AND ST

Initial data: $A \in M(n, n)$, $B \in M(n, r)$, $C \in M(m, n)$.

Start

1- Calculate: $\text{rank} [B \ AB \ \dots \ A^{n-1} B] = k$ and extract a base from the sub-space E_c generated by the columns of this matrice:

$$E_c = \langle e_1 \dots e_k \rangle, \dim E_c = k \leq n, E_c \subset E^n, E \in M(n, k),$$

$$E = [e_1 \dots e_k]$$

2- Calculate $\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} C^t & A^t C^t & \dots & (A^t)^{n-1} C^t \end{pmatrix} = p$ and extract a base from the sub-space E_o generated by the columns of this matrice:

$$E_o = \langle f_1 \dots f_p \rangle, \dim E_o = p \leq n, E_o \subset E^n, F \in M(n, p), F = [f_1 \dots f_p]$$

3- If $E_{no} = E_o^\perp$. calculate a base from the sub-space $E_c \cap E_{no}$, finding a fundamental system of solutions from the system:

$$F^t E \alpha = 0, \alpha \in R^k,$$

$$\text{being: } E_c = \{ v \in E^n : v = E \alpha, \forall \alpha \in R^k \}$$

$$\text{and } E_{no} = \{ v \in E^n : F^t v = 0 \}$$

Being the fundamental system of solutions lineally independent: $\{\alpha_1 \ \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_q\}$, where: $q \leq \min(k, n-p)$,

$\dim E_{no} = n - p = l$
 $g_i = \sum \alpha_{ij} e_j, i=1, \dots, q, E_c \cap E_{no} = \langle g_1, \dots, g_q \rangle = E_{cno}$
 4- To complete the vectorial $g_i, i = 1, \dots, q$ until a base in E_c applying the method of elimination of Gauss of the matrix $[g_1 \ g_2 \ \dots \ g_q \ e_1 e_2 \ \dots \ e_k]$
 Note: When applying the elimination method all the vectors $g_i, i = 1, \dots, q$, were used to build the escalar matrix. The vectors $e_{i_j}, j = 1, \dots, k - q$ that are used in this submatriz is those that complete the base.
 5- To find a base in $E_{no} = \langle h_1 \ h_2 \ \dots \ h_l \rangle$
 6- To complete the vectorial $g_i, i = 1, \dots, q$ until a base in E_{no} , applying the one method of elimination of Gauss of the matrix $[g_1 \ g_2 \ \dots \ g_q \ h_1 h_2 \ \dots \ h_l]$
 Note: All the vectorial $g_i, i = 1, \dots, q$ was used, that form the main step, the vectors $h_{i_j}, j = 1, \dots, k - q$ that are used to complete this matrix is those that complete the base.
 7- To complete until a base of E^n if it is necessary ($k + l - q < n$) applying the elimination method of Gauss to the matrix $[g_1 \ g_2 \ \dots \ g_q \ e_{i_1} e_{i_2} \ \dots \ e_{i_{k-q}} \ h_{j_1} \ h_{j_2} \ \dots \ h_{j_{l-q}} \ v_1 \ v_2 \ \dots \ v_n]$
 where the $v_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ are canonical vectors. To form the submatriz step only the v_i were used. When it is not possible to use the remaining columns these v_i used are those that complete the base.
 8- Construct the matrix of change of base:
 If $k + l - q = n$ then $T = [g_1 \ g_2 \ \dots \ g_q \ e_{i_1} e_{i_2} \ \dots \ e_{i_{k-q}} \ h_{j_1} \ h_{j_2} \ \dots \ h_{j_{l-q}}]$
 If $k + l - q < n$ then $T = [g_1 \ g_2 \ \dots \ g_q \ e_{i_1} e_{i_2} \ \dots \ e_{i_{k-q}} \ h_{j_1} \ h_{j_2} \ \dots \ h_{j_{l-q}} \ v_{m_1} \ v_{m_2} \ \dots \ v_{m_{i-q}}]$
 9- To make the reduction to the canonical form finding
 $\tilde{A} = T^{-1}AT, \tilde{B} = T^{-1}B, \tilde{y} = \tilde{C} = CT$
 The state variables with the index $\{i_1 \ i_2 \ \dots \ i_{k-q}\}$ are completely controllable and totally observables and they constitute the states of minimal representation of the analyzed system.
 In the canonical representation, we divide the state variables in 4 groups:
 Controllable and non observables, controllable and observables, not controllable and non observables, not controllable and observables.
 To determine the efficiency of this algorithm you can analyze their temporary complexity. The number of operations is of order K^3 , where $K = \max(n, r, m)$, since in all the procedures you can apply the method of elimination of Gauss and the number of operations in this is of the order of the third power of the maximum between the number of rows and the number of columns [6], for what its temporary complexity is of the order of $K^{\frac{3}{2}}$, it is therefore an algorithm polynomial.
 Notice you the only jump in the logical structure of this exhibition takes place when they are accepted without demonstration, the practical approaches of control and observation total, really it is enough to demonstrate only one of these criterion, for the relationship of duality that exists among them. These criterions are of great practical utility for their algorithm form however they have an abstract character and the demonstrations are sophisticated points.

The demonstration of the necessity of the condition on the range of the control matrix can be demonstrated in a relatively simple way, if we lean on in the Theorem of Hamilton-Cayle [7] that in spite of being a very important theorem of the algebra, and specially useful inside the Theory of Control, and it is not included in the undergraduate courses. Several variants of demonstration of this Theorem appear in [8], among them a very simple and elegant one based on purely algebraic arguments.

The demonstration of the sufficiency of the criterion is more complex, a relatively simple variant can be found in [7] based on the concept of group of accessibility and using the theory of the differential equations.

In [9] the necessity is demonstrated using Hamilton Cayley's Theorem and the formula of Sylvester that it is a generalization of the formula of interpolation of Lagrange for the case of the matrices. These information should be offered to the students, so that the interested ones in deepening in this theory have the appropriate bibliography.

CONCLUSIONS

It is developed an exhibition of the position and solution of the realization problem or identification of the lineal and stationary dynamic systems, without making use of the results of complex mathematical theories, related with the theory of the moments, the representation theorems of functional and lineal operators in spaces topologies and the theory of the matrices with elements in the field of the forms models - univariated that serve as foundation mathematics for the solution of this problem.

The unit of the exhibition of the realization theory or identification is achieved through the intuition, based on the interpretation of such physical concepts as: overlapping, control and observation, the exemplification, the analysis, the synthesis and the comparison.

A solution of the realization problem for the systems SISO is obtained in immediate form starting from the analysis and the comparison of the position and of the solution of the direct problem: " To find the transfer function applying the definition from this to the state pattern."

For study of the systems MIMO study, one proceeds to decompose these, by virtue of the lineality, in a subsystem group SISO. each one of which are applied the previous results, obtaining a tena (A,B,C) in which thematrice A is a cellular diagonal matrice. The generalization of this result is expressed by means of the elaboration of an algorithm that allows to obtain (A,B,C) for any particular case.

The existence of an infinite number of solutions of the equation matricial

$$C (S I - A)^{-1} B = G(S)$$

puts on evidence in the fact that any system algebraically equivalent to the one obtained, also carries out the behavior entrance-exit defined by the transfer womb $G(s)$.

Starting from the theory of the subspaces of a vectorial space, the systems algebraically equivalent and the physical concepts of total observation and total control are based in the obtaining of the canonical decomposition of the obtained

pattern and is a completely controllable subsystem and totally observable and carries out the behavior pattern entrance-exit of $G(s)$.

The fact that the subsystem of the state variables totally observables and completely controllable it determines the realization minimal of $G(s)$, it is easily accepted by the students, for the evident reduction of the dimension of the state space and the physical interpretation of the control concepts and total observation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Hing Cortón Rosina: Programs for the Applied development Mathematics in the UCLV, work presented in the event international Pedagogy 97.
- [2] Kolmogorov A. N,: The Mathematical in the Modern World, Izvestia, 1962.
- [3] Kalman R.E.: Mathematical Description of Linear Dynamical Systems, J.S.I.A.M. Control, Ser.A, Vol. 1, N o 2, U.S.A., 1963.
- [4] Sontang E.: Mathematical Control Theory, Deterministic Finite Dimensional Systems, Springer-Verlag Inc., New York, 1990.
- [5] Tijonov A.N, Kostomarov D.P.: Something about Applied Mathematics, Editorial MIR, Moscow, 1983.
- [6] Fadeev Faddeva: Computational Methods of Linear Algebra, Revolutionary Editions, Cuba, 1963
- [7] Alexandrov V.V.: Mathematical Modelación of Dynamic Systems, U.H., Cuba 1988.
- [8] Bellman R.: Introduction to the Análisis Matricial, Editorial Reverté, Barcelona, 1965
- [9] Ogata Katsuhiko: Engineering of Modern Control, Prentice Hall Hispanoamerican S. A., Mexico, 1993.